



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,229	09/12/2003	Joseph R. Hedrick	0112300-612	6841
29159	7590	11/03/2006	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC			SAGER, MARK ALAN	
P. O. BOX 1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			3714	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

10/661229

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

1022006

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The office has determined that the reply rec'd Aug 28, 2006 is a bona-fide attempt to respond to prior office action but it contains a serious omission, as per MPEP 714.03, for failing to properly provide citations where features of newly claimed invention is taught within originally filed specification such as retrieval of player data over network including player tracking data. The cited reply asserts no new matter has been added in first paragraph in remarks without addressing where support is found in instant specification which is deemed to be a serious omission. Further, filed reply fails to provide a proper reply by responding to all issues in prior action per 37 CFR 1.111 that states in part that a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. It further states in amending in reply to a rejection of claims in an application, the applicant must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited. The applicant must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. In this case, Applicant failed to properly address the obviousness holdings and stated a general allegation of patentability without addressing how they distinguish over references. It is noted no review of the merits of filed reply has been initiated and only a determination that an incomplete response was filed is indicated herein.

Since the submission appears to be a bona fide attempt to provide a complete reply to the prior Office action, Applicant is given a shortened statutory period of ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this letter, whichever is longer, to submit a complete reply. This shortened statutory period supersedes the time period set in the prior Office action. This time period may be extended pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a).



M. A. Sager  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 3712